Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at University of San Diego

Professional Services Division

April 17, 2002

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at the University of San Diego. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies.   On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

(1)   The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for University of San Diego and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

The institution must provide evidence of implementation of revised reading course content to ensure that each candidate participates in reading methods training that enables him/her to provide a comprehensive program of reading instruction aligned with the CA Reading/Language Arts Framework. The institution must also provide evidence of implementation of methods course content that includes exposure to instructional programs adopted by the State Board of Education for use in California public schools.

•   The institution must provide evidence of a revised over-arching program description with a "cohesive design" and a "cogent rationale" that will ensure that all preliminary administrative credential candidates, regardless of their cohort or special emphasis, are prepared to serve generally as a p-12 administrator anywhere in California, and allow for all possible alternative cohorts or paths.

•   That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of the full range of the school nursing proposed curriculum.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
  Preliminary
  Preliminary Internship

- Multiple Subject Credential
  CLAD Emphasis
  BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)

- Single Subject Credential

- Pupil Personnel Services
  School Counseling

- Education Specialist Credentials:
  Early Childhood Special Education: Level I & II
  Mild/Moderate Disabilities: Level I & II
  Moderate/Severe Disabilities: Level I & II
  Education Specialist Internship
  Early Childhood Special Education Certificate

- Health Education – School Nurse

(2) The team recommends that University of San Diego provide written evidence to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of these stipulations within one year from the date of this action. The team recommends that staff verify the appropriate action in relation to all stipulations.

(3) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.

- The University of San Diego be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.

- The University of San Diego be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2007-2008 academic year.

Background Information

The University of San Diego is an independent Catholic institution located in the north central region of the city of San Diego. It was founded in 1972 by the Catholic bishop of San Diego and the sisters of the Religious Congregation of the Sacred Heart, and for its first twenty-three years was organized into a college for women, a college for men, and

a coeducational law school. In 1972 the colleges and law school merged under an independent board of trustees, to form what is today the University of San Diego.

The university occupies 180 acres of tableland and includes nineteen major academic and administrative buildings, and student residences. Since the last CCTC visit, the university has constructed a parking facility and an athletic and cultural center. It has also acquired the former Chancery building of the Diocese of San Diego and renovated it for use as the central administration building on campus. The university recently completed construction of a 90,000-square-foot facility that houses the Joan B. Kroc Institute of Peace and Justice and had just broken ground on a 150,000-square-foot Center for Science and Technology. The president and the provost have met with the Dean of the School of Education to discuss a wide range of opportunities to enhance the preparation of teachers in the areas of Science, Math and Technology. Plans are underway for the development of partnerships with local schools and community partners to improve instruction.

Approximately 7000 students, 300 faculty, and 1200 total employees make up the USD campus community. The university's top administration includes the president, the provost/vice president of Academic Affairs and the Vice President of Finance and Administration, Mission and Ministry, Student Affairs, and University Relations. The President reports to the Board of Trustees and the five Vice Presidents report to the president. Five deans (Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Education, Law, and Nursing) report to the provost.

The University of San Diego includes a School of Education, a College of Arts and Science, the Philip Y. Hahn School of Nursing and Health Science, a School of Law, and a School of Business Administration and Engineering. USD offers the Ph.D. degree in Nursing, the Ed.D. in Leadership Studies, the J.D. in Law, the master's degree in twenty-two fields, and undergraduate majors in thirty-five fields. All undergraduate students regardless of major, participate in a required general education program whose curriculum includes requirements in writing, logic, mathematics, the natural and social sciences, foreign language, humanities, fine arts, religious studies, and philosophy.

The School of Education leadership team is made up of the Director of Graduate Programs, assistant dean, Endowed Chair faculty, and program directors in Learning and Teaching, Leadership, Counseling and Marriage and Family Therapy.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in Spring 2000 and met with institutional leadership initially at that time. Over the next two years, there were numerous consultant staff meetings with faculty, program directors and institutional administration. The meetings led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical details and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. In May of 2000, the consultant met with the institutional contact person to develop a strategy for the review of the multi-site locations and consider the size of

the team. The team size agreement was developed in June 2000. The Team Leader, Dr. Marilyn Draheim, was selected in September 2001. In February 2002, the team leader and the staff consultant met with the representatives of the University of San Diego to make final determinations about the interview schedule, the template for the visit and any remaining organizational details. Additional consultations took place during the remaining time before the visit.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to all programs and for the institution as a whole. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using the California Program Standards for all programs.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the institutional contact person, the Faculty and the staff consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of thirteen consisting of a Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster of two members; a Basic Credential Cluster of three members; a Specialist Credential Cluster of two members; and a Services Credential Cluster of four members. The team added an additional person to focus on the reading study. The institutional contact person and the consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The staff consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework.*

Each member of the Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the institution's responses to the Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for each credential area.   Members of the Basic and Specialist and Services Clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered Common Standards issues.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday, April 14. The team arrived on Sunday afternoon with a meeting of the entire team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters.   The institution sponsored a working dinner on Sunday evening to provide an orientation to the institution.

On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, April 15, 16 and 17, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook.*.

Planning of the interview schedule was a very complex task. A total of 426 group and individual interviews were conducted by the team members in the two days devoted to collection of data. Each team member made interview contact with approximately 35 interviewees in that time. There was extensive consultation among the members of all clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and shared information about findings. Tuesday evening was set aside for an additional team meeting and the writing of the team report. During those work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

Decisions About Standards and Preparation

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework,* and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met," Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns or "Standard Not Met." The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards that pointed out any standards that were less than fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team followed two decision tracks: one track for the 2042 teacher preparation program and a regular track for all other programs. For 2042 the options were Met, Met with Concerns and Not Met. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program areas. Across all programs, only six standards (three in one credential area and one each in two other credential areas) were less than fully met, and they were met minimally.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding of the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Recommendations by the Team

The team discussed an initial draft of the report on Tuesday evening and made a tentative accreditation recommendation. After the report was finished, the entire team met Wednesday morning for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework.* In its deliberations, the team decided that although six program standards were less than fully met, the overall quality of the programs was good. The team did list some concerns, but did not feel that the concerns

were of sufficient magnitude such that any additional standards were less than fully met. The team then considered the appropriate accreditation decision for the institution. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations," Probationary Accreditation, or "Denial of Accreditation." After thorough discussion, the entire team voted to recommend the status of **"Accreditation with Technical Stipulations."** The recommendation was based on the unanimous agreement of the team.

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION - ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT

Institution: **University of San Diego**

Dates of Visit: **April 14 - 17**

Accreditation Team
Recommendation: **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS**

The accreditation team unanimously supports the above accreditation recommendation based on a careful analysis of all available data presented in the institution's self study reports, documentation available at the time of the visit, and interviews with a wide variety of informants. Following are the specific stipulations:

Multiple Subject Credential Program - Standard 7-A
> Required Element (a): The institution must provide evidence of implementation of revised (EDUC 183/283) course content to ensure that each candidate participates in reading methods training that enables him/her to provide a comprehensive program of reading instruction aligned with the CA Reading/Language Arts Framework. The institution must also provide evidence of implementation of methods course content that includes exposure to instructional programs adopted by the State Board of Education for use in California public schools.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program

- The institution must provide evidence of a revised over-arching program description with a "cohesive design" and a "cogent rationale" that will ensure that all preliminary administrative credential candidates, regardless of their cohort or special emphasis, are prepared to serve generally as a p-12 administrator anywhere in California, and allow for all possible alternative cohorts or paths.

Health Services - School Nurse

- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of the full range of the school nursing proposed curriculum.

The team recommends that University of San Diego provide evidence to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of these stipulations within one year from the date of this action.

Rationale:
The recommendation of the accreditation team for ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS was based on a thorough review of the self study documentation presented to the team, additional information in the form of exhibits, extensive interviews with campus and field-based personnel, and additional information requested from administrators during the visit. The team felt it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making

overall and programmatic judgments about the institution's operation of its professional preparation programs. All common standards were met. Six program standards were met minimally with qualitative concerns in three programs, and there were concerns expressed by the team. The overall quality of the programs is good. The recommendation of the team was based on the following:

Common Standards: All eight common standards were met.

Data especially from students, graduates, and employers were very complimentary about the manner in which the University of San Diego organized its programs, the qualifications of faculty delivering program content, and the students' perceived learning, by students themselves and their employers. As a result of coursework and field experience, those recommended for credentials were prepared to function appropriately in classrooms, service positions, and specialist positions.

However, the team did identify some specific concerns, mostly related to the assurance of consistent excellence across program areas and across the variety of sites where programs are offered.

Program Standards: In general most of the standards for the range of programs offered by the University of San Diego were met. However, there are a few standards in program areas that were met minimally with qualitative concerns. These areas of concern are detailed below:

Multiple Subject: All program standards were met with the exception of Standard 7-A which was met with concerns. Referring to element (a), the team found that the EDUC 183/283 reading methods course content is only partially aligned with the State-adopted academic content standards in the California Reading/Language Arts Frameworks (across K-6 grade levels) and does not include exposure to instructional programs adopted by the State Board of Education for use in California public schools. The California Reading/Language Arts Framework is only cited during one of the thirteen sessions rather than throughout the course.

Administrative Services: All standards were fully met except for Standards one and three, which were minimally met with qualitative concerns. The institution does not have over-arching language in program descriptions, integrating all the paths to the credential. The institution does not address the program content delivery regarding curriculum design options.

Health Services Credential-School Nurse Program: All standards are met, except for Standards 13, 17 and 20, which were minimally met with qualitative concerns. The program does not provide evidence of proposed changes in their curriculum, ensure practicum in school settings, and ensure continuation of an assistant program coordinator.

Team Leader: **Marilyn Draheim**
University of the Pacific

Common Standards Cluster:
Curtis L. Guaglianone, Cluster Leader
California State University, Fresno

Herbert D. Bonds
Kern Community College District

Basic Credential Program Cluster:
Beth Bythrow, Cluster Leader
Los Angeles Unified School District

Jeffrey S. Hittenberger
Vanguard University of Southern California

Patricia Barrett
Grant Joint Union School District

Karl Skindrud
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Specialist Credential Program Cluster:
Christine Givner, Cluster Leader
California State University, Los Angeles

Brigid Richards
San Rafael High School District

Services Credential Program Cluster:
Daniel C. Elliott, Cluster Leader
Azusa Pacific University

Marcel Soriano
California State University, Los Angeles

Cathy S. Turney
West Covina Unified School District

Janet Needman
San Jose City College

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
Institutional Self Study
Course Syllabi
Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbooks
Follow-up Survey Results
Needs Analysis Results
Information Booklets
Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stands. Cluster	Basic Cred. Cluster	Specialist Cred. Cluster	Services Cred. Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	1	5	22	14	16	58
Institutional Administration	4	16	5	3	8	36
Candidates		42	18	20	51	131
Graduates	2	4	38	8	21	73
Employers of Graduates		1	7	3	9	20
Supervising Practitioners		5	15	6	9	35
Advisors		2	2	7	8	19
School Administrators		6	4	4	6	20
Credential Analyst		1	2	1	3	7
Advisory Committee		1	8	14	4	27

TOTAL   426

Common Standards

Standard 1 – Educational leadership **Standard Met**

The School of Education appears to be involved in various change processes since the appointment of Dr. Paula Cordeiro as Dean in 1998. The atmosphere of enthusiasm noted in the program documents is apparent based on conversations with the faculty, students, and the learning community supported by the USD School of Education.

The primary mission of teaching and encouraging research and scholarship supportive of the teaching/learning environment, as well as the articulated desire to, "transfer a moral vision to students," is clearly identifiable through documents and conversations with administration, faculty, and students. The School of Education is well accomplished as a professional school whose purpose is to prepare professionals for leadership roles in teaching, counseling, and administration.

Dean Cordeiro is the chief academic officer for the School and is responsible for academic and administrative operations. Her actions and professional ability are supported by USD administration, and the School of Education, in-turn, supports the vision and mission of the university. The dean 's vision, demonstrated by creative planning, forward thinking, and decisive action, is to share the governance and/or delegate responsibility among the faculty, who have a direct line of accountability to her, and to the four program directors, the director of graduate programs, and the assistant dean. There are monthly meetings with the administrative team, the SOE faculty conduct monthly meetings for collaboration and decision making, faculty are involved in a committee structure required for advancement, and the adjunct faculty meet with program directors and advisory committee members to ensure consistency of curriculum and instruction throughout programs.

Strengths

The University Mission and Vision are clearly articulated at all levels of leadership throughout the University.

The faculty and administration are to be commended for their enthusiasm, team spirit, commitment and dedication, which leads to ensure a high quality education for all students in the various professional preparation programs.

The proven expertise of the dean in the area of excellent administration preparation programs is clearly reflected as a positive influence upon each of the School of Education's programs as well as in the organization and operation of the school.

Concerns

None Noted

Common Standard 2 – Resources   **Standard Met**

Adequate resources for support of teaching and scholarship are available. Faculty receive funds to develop professionally. New faculty support is strong with the opportunity to purchase an additional $500 worth of new books for the library to support their scholarship and teaching.

A newly renovated building was occupied in August 2000 with plans for a new building under design. Student facilities including classrooms and meeting rooms, libraries and academic computing facilities are well-equipped. The School of Education boasts a class size of a 15 student member average per section. The Endowed Chair in SPED exemplifies their moral vision with the Chair's intent to expand faculty understanding and expertise in the various areas of exceptionality and candidate skills necessary to become effective special educators.

The Writing Center for students is administered by the English Department and includes faculty-recommended tutors. Disability Services are in compliance with ADA and Section 504 regulations, and the goal of the Disability Services is to promote student independence. The EOP offers support including free tutoring to ensure students' academic success.

There is one credential analyst providing assistance to students.

Students feel well prepared and field supervisors are able to provide quality supervision in the MS, SS, and SPED programs with supervision loads of 1 to 5.

The Copley library provides sufficient print with 2,200 journals and 300,000 books for support of initial and advanced programs of the SOE.

Computer facilities are the responsibility of a CIO who works to streamline all faculty and program technology needs. The internet is available both inside the library and in the residence halls, faculty offices, and homes of USD students and employees. There is a technology staff of 21 professionals who service 7 public computer labs that offer programs including office-suite, internet applications, statistical analysis tools, web publishing, and multimedia development tools. They also support 900 University owned client stations and multiple servers for 8000 students, faculty, and staff accounts.

Strengths

Central Administration is attentive to the needs of the SOE to provide additional tenure track line positions.

The placement of the Center for Teaching and Learning in the SOE is recognition of the excellent reputation and professional capability of faculty in the professional development of faculty in other Schools within the University.

The university has provided staff and advisory support for programs at levels clearly reflective of the "service-orientation" characteristic to the mission statement.

Concerns
None Noted

Common Standard 3 – Faculty   **Standard Met**

Full time faculty members in the SOE have degrees appropriate to their field of expertise and areas in which they teach. An effort has been made to hire the most qualified part time faculty and supervisors of field experiences. Attention is paid to carefully select individuals who share the vision and mission of the university.

The unit demonstrates concerted effort to hire diverse faculty who understand the culture of California's Population. Faculty recruitment seems to be difficult due to the high cost of housing in the San Diego area. Since 1998, six out of eleven hires are Affirmative Action hires.

The Irvine Grant has been received twice and has helped identify methods that have worked with diverse student populations and supported the development of programs that support learning for different racial and ethnic groups.

USD hosts conferences that contribute to faculty professional development. The SOE recognizes that Professional Development and continued research are essential to high quality programs and financially supports faculty efforts. Faculty Research grants are funded to support professional growth and research efforts.

The Center for Learning and Teaching was established in the School of Education in May 2000, and provides staff development opportunities to enhance teaching, assessment of student learning, and professional development of faculty. The Center's establishment within the jurisdiction of the SOE was the Provost's effort to recognize the importance and value of the School of Education.

Three categories of faculty recognition are utilized – faculty research grants, merit pay, and The University Professorship. Both SOE and School of Nursing select a full time tenured colleague for the university professorship to represent each School.

A formal re-appointment, promotion and tenure process is practiced consistently. The Area Appointment, Rank, and Tenure committee AART consists of 7 elected members, 5 tenured representatives, and 2 non-tenured members who vote on peers in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service and support of the university mission.

Evaluations are conducted of faculty by multiple means from students, peers, self assessments, and a merit pay evaluation. The Faculty Planning and Evaluation Report is also utilized by the Dean and program directors to recommend merit pay and make decisions of non-rehire of part-time faculty and field supervisors.

Strengths

Both current candidates and graduates unanimously agree that the knowledge, experience, and quality of the faculty are excellent. Graduates report that they learned a tremendous amount from their professors that is relevant to their work with students.

Concerns

Core program faculty in the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program should play a stronger role in the oversight of course content where partnership agreements have district personnel providing course instruction and delivery.

Standard 4 – Evaluation   **Standard Met**

The School of Education provides evidence that all credential programs are evaluated through formative and summative approaches. Periodic surveys are conducted to ensure that the programs are meeting the needs of the field. The last WASC accreditation visit provided a 2010 affirmation of accreditation. The Dean reviews all course evaluations as part of her faculty evaluation procedure. The School utilizes advisory committees in each program to provide a source of evaluative information.

Course evaluations provide candidates a chance to express their perception of the faculty member and the particular course. Candidate evaluations of practicum and fieldwork sites, candidate evaluations of field experiences, and student teacher evaluations of cooperating teachers and university supervisors are used to shape field experiences.

Program graduates take part in the USD Alumni surveys. The latest survey was in 2001 with a previous survey in 1999.

Surveys of public school teachers, counselors, administrators, and advisory councils assist in planning program development. These are augmented by regular Advisory Committee meetings, and university supervisor evaluations of cooperating teachers, counselors, or administrators. A recent survey of employers of graduates in 2001 provided recent information which initiated additional advising services.

Changes in course syllabi were noted by students as a result of candidate input. Other changes as a result of program surveys or other assessment methods were noted by students, faculty, or administration, and include office hour restructuring, a student handbook, a faculty advising handbook, student program list-serves, better collaboration with career services, and improved instructional technology concepts.

Strengths

Changes as a result of program surveys:
• office hour restructuring
• student handbook
• faculty advising handbook
• student program list-serves
• better collaboration with career services
• improved instructional technology concepts

Concerns

None Noted

Standard 5 – Admissions   **Standard Met**

Admission criteria and procedures for all programs are clearly described and available to students. Students seeking entrance into SOE programs can readily get admission information from admission counselors, program faculty, or from a wide variety of printed material. Admission into the SOE programs requires that students meet both USD and SOE admission criteria, and the university admissions office works closely with SOE staff to ensure coordination of admission services.

In order to gain admission into the SOE programs, all students must meet clearly specified criteria, including appropriate degree, minimum GPA, subject and writing proficiency, and basic skills. Interviews with program faculty and admissions office staff made it clear that admissions criteria were consistently and accurately applied.

Interviews with current students and school personnel at sites where SOE students are serving consistently affirmed the high level of personal, intellectual, and professional qualities these students bring to the program.

Strengths

None Noted

Concerns

None Noted

Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance   **Standard Met**

Overall advisement in the SOE programs appears to be strong. Programs make use of individual and group meetings, introductory courses, handbooks, meetings with faculty members, and several advising centers on campus. A school-wide orientation meeting is held each Fall semester to introduce students to the School. All full time faculty in the SOE participate in student advising functions and all credential candidates are required to meet with their advisor prior to registration every semester.

A new program specialist works with undergraduate students to advise and make sure students understand the Diversified Liberal Arts (DLA) requirements which supplement the weekly open office hours all full time faculty are required to maintain.

Current and former students needing assistance report being well-served. When problems arose in courses or in school placements, these were addressed quickly and effectively. Interviews with faculty indicate a high degree of commitment and concern for the success of all students.

All faculty, the Program Specialist, the Credential Analyst, professional counselors and advisors, Program Directors, and staff participate in advising and are readily available for all students. Communication between the different levels of advising is strong with a weekly update email from the Dean, and program list-serves between members of

each program. Program information as well as SOE information is distributed through an information list serve to students as well – it includes information about deadlines, program changes, schedule changes, job fairs, etc.

Several centers including the Writing and Mathematics Center, the EOP office, Multicultural Center, International Resources Center, the Woman's Center, and the Disabled Students Center provide ongoing support for students with special needs.

Students and members of the professional community report that personal assistance is provided by faculty who are well connected to the professional community. The Career Services Center is available for students interested in teacher recruitment fairs and they provide job announcements, and resume preparation assistance. On campus interviews with school districts are also arranged for candidates.

Graduate Bulletin, program brochures, the SOE Web Page, and plentiful advising provide sufficient and readily available information for all candidates.

Minimum GPA of 2.75 Undergraduate and 3.0 Graduate are consistently maintained. Program Directors report that professional and personal advising assists in counseling students out of the program if they are not suited for the profession.

Strengths

Concerted effort has been made to address advising concerns identified by surveys and assessment of candidates, graduates, and advisory committee members. There are multiple points of advisement for all students in every program.

Concerns

None Noted

Common Standard 7 – School Collaboration   **Standard Met**

The unit has a commitment to extensive and sequenced field experiences as essential elements of the professional preparation of candidates at both the initial and advanced levels. Planned programs integrate such experiences in ways which reflect the careful planning and implementation of philosophical constructs identified by administration, faculty, and program directors.

The USD and SOE administrators and faculty are to be commended for a variety of collaborative projects with the K-12 community, including internships, BTSA Programs, San Diego Recruitment Center, the Marshall Elementary Project to promote community collaboration and improve student achievement by supporting teaching and learning, a Broad Foundation grant to develop urban leaders for K-12 schools, the PPS School-Based Practicum with Grossmont High School, the selection of field sites for student teachers, and many others.

The University President as well as all levels of the administration value school partnerships to help fulfill the mission of USD. The Conley Library also participates in a consortium of four libraries, USD, San Diego State, UC San Diego, and California State University San Marcos for library sharing, which has a one day turn-around service between branches. Students and faculty commented on the success of this initiative.

USD and SOE faculty initiated the creation of the consortium of colleges and universities in the San Diego area. The Consortium provides collaborative workshops to which all cooperating teachers and universities are invited. Using recent funding from a Girard Grant, the consortium will convert to a web-based program to promote additional participation by USD field supervisors.

Strengths

- PPS School Based Practicum with Grossmont High School
- Consortium of schools for Field Work Supervisors
- Interaction between the School of Education and the K-12 Community
- Employers' statements that the SOE is always looking for ways to give back to the community.
- Service Learning collaborations with districts
- Partnerships with Chula Vista and Sweet Water School Districts sought to serve districts with diverse populations.

Additionally, Administration Program partnerships with San Diego City Schools are exemplary for university/district collaboration in professional preparation programs.

Concerns

None Noted

Common Standard 8 – Field Supervisors   **Standard Met**

Candidates generally report that they are satisfied with their site supervisors. There is agreement from the field that master teachers are not self-selected, but chosen based on the quality of their teaching. Program directors in all programs collaborate with local school districts and administrators to identify and place candidates in schools.

Each supervising teacher, counselor, or principal is given a handbook and provided an orientation to his or her role as a site supervisor. University supervisors are all experienced in their fields, appropriately credentialed, and hold appropriate degrees.

Field experience supervisors or support providers in the Learning and Teaching program is evaluated and receives remuneration according to the policy and/or bargaining unit agreement of the district. In each program field supervisors and support providers are evaluated formally and informally by both the university supervisors and the candidates.

Strengths

None Noted

Concerns

None Noted

Multiple Subject Credential Program

Findings on Standards
After reviewing the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Multiple Subject Program, with the exception of Standard 7A, which is met with concerns.

Program Standard 7A (Reading)   **Met with Concerns**

Candidates receive training that includes strong preparation for teaching comprehension skills; a strong literature component; strategies that promote and guide pupil independent reading; and instructional approaches that incorporate listening, speaking, reading and writing for speakers of English and English Learners.

However, the following element has been only partially met:

Element (a): The team found that the EDUC 183/283 reading methods course content is only partially aligned with the State-adopted academic content standards in the California Reading/Language Arts Frameworks (across K-6 grade levels) and does not include exposure to instructional programs adopted by the State Board of Education for use in California public schools. The California Reading/Language Arts Framework is only cited during one of the thirteen sessions rather than throughout the course.

Strengths

USD candidates and graduates reported that they receive a high quality education preparing them to enter the teaching profession. This was confirmed by interviews with supervisors, employers, and master teachers. Graduates enjoy the high regard surrounding communities and school districts afford them.

Candidates, graduates, and faculty shared a strong sense of vision and purpose. The six infused program principles (especially reflection, values, service, social justice, and diversity) consistently emerged in conversation as participants addressed strengths of the USD program.

Candidates and graduates described faculty in the School of Education as knowledgeable, supportive, and engaging. Program curriculum emphasizes the California Content Standards and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and prepares candidates well for the realities of the classroom.

Through initial conferences with their Supervisors, student teachers are oriented to the student teaching process. Supervisors visit and provide feedback to student teachers on a regular basis, meet regularly with master teachers, and complete formal evaluations at the mid-point of the semester (formative) and the end of the semester (summative). Supervisors and principals describe USD candidates as well-prepared, eager, and flexible.

The USD program should be commended for proactively addressing new requirements associated with SB 2042. The Multiple Subject Program has added a new course, EDSP

189/289 Healthy Environments and Inclusive Education (3 units), which will better equip candidates to serve diverse students. CLAD requirements are embedded in the Program for all Multiple Subject candidates. BCLAD (Spanish) was available in the old program for Multiple Subject candidates and will continue to be available in the new program.

The Program is also in the process of revising assessment methods to align with requirements of SB 2042, integrating TPEs and TPA into the process. Among other changes, candidates are now required to develop a portfolio throughout their coursework and fieldwork rather than only during the student teaching experience.

The Program is building stronger relationships with partner districts and schools, including formalizing partnerships with local school districts. The Program is now assigning students to pre-approved practicum sites rather than having students identify placements on their own.

The Program's new approach to addressing the SB 2042 technology standards infuses technology across the curriculum.

Finally, the Program has addressed concerns regarding advisement by creating an advising checklist and student handbook, as well as hiring a Program Specialist to facilitate the advisement process.

Concerns

No additional concerns noted.

<div align="center">

Single Subject Credential Program

</div>

Findings on Standards
After reviewing the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Single Subject Program.

USD graduates and candidates describe the School of Education faculty as knowledgeable, supportive, and engaging. Program curriculum emphasizes the California Content Standards and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession; the Program prepares candidates for the realities of the classroom. Appreciating the opportunities to connect theory and practice, candidates and graduates describe their field experiences as helpful and rewarding. Candidates and graduates particularly value the Program's emphasis on cultural diversity and the preparation they receive to teach in diverse settings. Candidates reflect on theory and practice by means of Wiske's "Teaching for Understanding" model.

Student teachers and their supervisors receive an orientation; supervisors regularly attend and participate in the student teaching seminars, which are held throughout the semester. Supervisors visit and provide feedback to student teachers on a regular basis, meet regularly with master teachers, and complete formal evaluations at the mid-point

of the semester (formative) and the end of the semester (summative). Supervisors and principals describe USD candidates as well-prepared, eager, and flexible.

"**Program Standard 7B (Single Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English). Strengths:** Single Subject candidates received training that: (in Element a) Is aligned with the Grade 7 - 12 components of the CA Reading / Language Arts Framework and content Standards; (Element b) Includes a rich array of effective strategies for developing content-based reading over varied levels and language backgrounds; (Element c) Focuses on teaching comprehension skills and strategies, decoding and spelling patterns; diagnostics assessment strategies; and use of oral and written language for increasing content knowledge; (Element d) Includes the structure of the English language; (Element e) Has adequate resources to staff content-based reading methods courses with full or part-time faculty; (Element f) Has field experiences that provide opportunities to participate in effective reading instruction; and (Element g) Applied newly established criteria for the selection of classroom teachers to supervise candidates that assure modeling of effective [reading] practices.

Strengths
The USD program should be commended for proactively addressing new requirements associated with SB 2042.   The single subject program has added new course requirements, including EDUC 184/284 Methods of Teaching English Language and Academic Development (3 units) and EDSP 189/289 Healthy Environments and Inclusive Education (3 units), which will better equip candidates to serve diverse students. These new requirements insure that single subject candidates will acquire the equivalent of CLAD preparation, whereas many single subject graduates in the old program did not obtain CLAD as part of their credential preparation.

To align with the requirements of SB 2042, the Program is also in the process of revising assessment methods, integrating TPEs and TPA into the process. Among other changes, candidates are now required to develop a portfolio throughout their program rather than only during the student teaching experience. The portfolio will address SB 2042 by featuring "centerpiece" assignments and thematic infusion of Program principles.   Additionally, the Program is now assigning students to pre-approved practicum sites, rather than having student identify placements on their own.

Finally, the program has made improvements in the advisement processes; evidence includes hiring a Program Specialist to facilitate the advisement process.

Concerns
None noted.

<center>

Education Specialist Credential Programs:
Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe: Level I and Level II
Early Childhood Special Education: Level I, Level II, and Certificate
Internship Credential

</center>

Findings on Standards:
The Education Specialist credential programs (Level I and Level II) in Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, Internship, and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) as well as the ECSE Certificate program were recently approved by the California Commission on

Accreditation (COA). Though Level II has been approved by COA and is well planned, the special education faculty members are just beginning implementation of Level II. Based on interviews (with candidates, faculty, employers, advisory board members, graduates, field supervisors, and intern support providers), document review, and site visits, the team determines that all standards are fully met.

Strengths:
The Special Education faculty is to be commended for ongoing strong collaboration with relevant stakeholders including school district partners, parents of students with exceptional needs, and local school administrators. It is clear that the information and professional opinions gathered from the Special Education Advisory Board substantively informs program development and refinement.

The curriculum is rigorous with expectations for high academic performance clearly articulated. Early and ongoing fieldwork is integrated across the program to ensure that teacher candidates have ample opportunity to apply theory to practice. Graduates and current students of the educational specialist credential programs state that the teacher preparation curriculum is meaningful, providing ample knowledge and skills to use in their classroom teaching.

The faculty of the University of San Diego is highly regarded by peers, graduates, employers, and candidates. The candidates and graduates who were interviewed consistently expressed appreciation for the availability, accessibility, and care provided to them. Students appreciated the small class size at USD. Many stated that they chose to enroll in this program because of the intimate, personalized, and exciting learning environment.

Concerns:

None noted.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards   **Standard Met Minimally**
                                                   With Qualitative Concerns

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program at the University of San Diego is in its third year of operation, though it has been a well-respected institution for graduate programs at the masters and doctoral levels for many years. The visiting team reviewed program documentation, student files, course syllabi, faculty vitae, and documents reflecting collaboration between the University program administration and San Diego City school district. The team interviewed current program candidates, program graduates, program faculty, program and school of education administrators, university leaders, and advisory group members.

Based on this extensive investigation, the visiting team finds that all relevant CCTC program standards for the preliminary administrative services credential are either met or minimally met. Standards Two and Four through Nineteen are considered fully met and Standards One and Three are minimally met with qualitative concerns.

Standard One: Program Design, Rationale, and Coordination

<div align="right">

**Standard met minimally
with qualitative concerns**

</div>

The preliminary administrative credential at the University of San Diego can be pursued via three distinct paths. The paths are each administered by different leaders and support staff or faculty. Consequently, the team found there were differences of understanding about how candidates in the three paths acquired the requisite understanding to address all of the CCTC program standards.

1. The on-campus program with 4 candidates has one specific set of course requirements to meet CCTC program standards. These candidates tend to be members of other graduate degree programs at USD, such as the Doctor of Education.
2. The ELDA program currently has 14 candidates (apprentices) from San Diego City Schools who complete a different listing of courses from the regular credential candidates. These apprentices are selected by San Diego City Schools officials and supported with release from teaching, tuition reduction grants, practical mentoring and supervised field daily experiences through shadowing and working under the supervision of Mentor Principals. These Mentor Principals are also trained specifically for this task. The school district and the School of Education leadership collaborate on this training as well. These apprentices take a year to complete credential requirements. The present cohort is the second in the history of this program and most of the first cohort are already practicing principals and vice principals in the district.
3. The ELDA program also has a second cohort of nine state-credentialed interns serving in administrative positions with San Diego City Schools while completing their regular credential requirements. These interns take two years to complete requirements for the credential. The present cohort is the first in the history of the program.
4. The ELDA paths are supported and sustained by a significant grant achieved by the School of Education Leadership and San Diego City Schools' leadership.

Concerns
1. Faculty members did not describe the ELDA program options consistently. Full time faculty in the leadership department expressed a lack of opportunity to have input or oversight into the content of the ELDA course segments.
2. Students in the ELDA Internship program did not express full understanding of all they need to study to complete the entire credential over the two-year period. Leaders of the ELDA did not recognize the differences between their programs and the on-campus program.
3. The overall design of the three different tracks lacks a consistent and coherent integrating rationale.

The team views this as a concern for better articulation among all the entities in this *single* administrative credential program that is credentialing people to serve as administrators for the *entire state* of California and not just San Diego City Schools.

Standard Three: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Standard met minimally
with qualitative concerns

The language of Standard Three calls for a "study of alternative designs for school curriculum, delivery, and evaluation of instructional programs. . ." The team found that students interviewed were not able to identify or describe designs for curriculum, models, or patterns by any language. A search of course syllabi revealed no evident emphasis on specific models for curriculum design other than "problem-based" and "literacy framework." Faculty interviews revealed that they only address those curriculum designs that are brought up by the candidates as case-problems for class discussion.

Program Strengths
The district and the university are to be commended for their pioneering efforts to create effective partnerships to prepare instructional leaders in schools. This model lays useful groundwork for institutions like USD to establish such partnerships with multiple districts and districts with multiple institutions. The level of mentoring accomplished in the ELDA cohort model raises the bar significantly for all universities to ensure that district-based site level administrator-mentors are both correctly identified, supported for their mentoring tasks, and recognized for the work they put into the process.

Standards 11 through 19 call for hard evidence to document that "each candidate" demonstrates or is able to function at the high quality level as delimited by each standard statement. In one of the ELDA cohorts a field adviser/coordinator (employed through the major grant by the school district) has created a most comprehensive and outstanding system for proving that each of the 14 candidates are demonstrating success or ability in each of these areas.

The full time faculty members in the department are extremely competent and well informed about the best practice in educational leadership. Students interviewed, who had experienced them, simply raved about the excellence of these faculty members in both their content and their instructional processes.

The Dean of the School of Education is very involved in sharing her mastery of administration programs from across the nation and contributing to the creation of an innovative program that prepares candidates for difficult urban school service.

Students expressed high marks for the instruction support staff in dealing with support issues relating to enrollment, registration, or other record maintenance functions. Many indicated how surprised and affirmed they were when experiencing this level of respect for them as a person and not a mere number, as they had experienced at other institutions.

The advisory personnel and administrative assistants were viewed by the candidates as often going out of the way to be helpful and supportive of candidate needs and processing through the program.

Concerns
Since a district-based cohort model is the dominant venue for the majority of students, care must be taken that instructional leaders are able to understand and fully apply many of the recognized models for curriculum design in serving school instructional teams as decisions are made about ultimate curriculum design and delivery at the various schools and districts where the credential authorizes service.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Credential Program

Findings on Standards

The Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program with specialization in School Counseling was evaluated according to the standards approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The team finds the program meets all of the applicable generic and program standards. The program has a strong theoretical and conceptual base that is well integrated with field-based experience. Additionally, the program provides highly qualified faculty who are actively engaged in collaborative counseling leadership initiatives with practitioners in the field.

Strengths

- The University is to be commended for its academic leadership in the area of multi-cultural counseling by infusing multicultural content throughout the curriculum, as well as maintaining a focused course. Candidates and graduates consistently mentioned that they felt ready to assist diverse students in their fieldwork and professional practice.
- Generally, students had high praise for tenure-track and adjunct faculty for their ability to provide a wealth of theory-based knowledge, as well as practical application of skills in the field. Program faculty were often commended by practitioners in the field for their active collaboration with their school districts and community-based organizations.
- Students reported that both full-time and adjunct faculty are readily available for advisement and consultation.
- Program faculty and directors should be commended for taking a leadership role in promoting student participation in professional societies at the national, state and regional level. Students made frequent reference to their participation in the Counseling Leadership Forum as part of their organizational class.
- Generally students had high praise for the quality of instruction, the practical application of field-based experience and involvement in service learning activities.

Concern

- Although generally candidates demonstrated knowledge of legal enablements and constraints affecting pupil personnel services specialists and pupils in California Schools, there was insufficient content related to laws related to legal provisions of student discipline, including suspension,

expulsion and due process. Student comments generally reflected a lack of consistent information about this area in their coursework.

Health Services (School Nurse)

Findings on Standards

Standard 13 Attainment of School Nurse Competencies   **Minimally Met**
                                                             Qualitative Concerns

The visiting team reviewed program documentation, student files, course syllabi, and faculty vitae. The team found that the institution meets the standard minimally as it offers limited opportunities to attain the standards and professional competencies in Category V and to apply and practice those standards and competencies in the school nurse clinical experience

As evidenced in the field experience notebooks and described in the Health Services Credential-School Nurse Program (HSC-SNP) Handbook, the practicum experience appears to be clinic based and not in an educational setting. The clinic experience under the preceptorship of a Nurse Practitioner is an added value toward the advancement of knowledge and skills for assessment, diagnosis, and the treatment of children with health problems. However, as the Health Services Credential-School Nurse Program currently exists, the program has no specifically designed school nurse clinical practicum to apply and practice those standards and competencies (i.e. Category V).

Health Services Credential - School Nurse Program Coordinators, as documented in the institutional self-study, reported proposed curriculum revisions. Included in the revisions is NU241, Selective Clinical Practicum (1u), a new practicum specifically designed for nursing in the educational setting. The practicum will provide 45 hours to attain the standards and professional competencies in Category V and to apply and practice those standards and competencies in a school setting.   NU241 will be paired in Spring semester 2003 with NU227, Nursing in the Schools, the substantive theory and content course for school nurses. Didactic and clinical experiences are related and integrated to promote optimal learning.

Standard 17 Clinical Experience   **Minimally Met**
                                                             Qualitative Concerns

The institution meets the standard minimally as it provides (1) clinical practicum, (2) opportunity to practice school nursing, and (3) achievement of the Standards in Category V and (4) defines and describes candidates' roles, responsibilities, and performance expectations.

The institution does not provide evidence of a substantive supervised clinical experience under the guidance of a credential school nurse preceptor for Health Services Credential-School Nurse students in the school setting.

Without adequate opportunity to apply and practice those school nursing skills and competencies with children of varying ages, developmental stages and health needs in a school setting, the Health Services Credential – School Nurse Program candidate's training is inadequate.

Without adequate opportunity of a clinical practicum in a school setting, the achievement of the Standards in Category V is difficult within the Health Services Credential-School Nurse Program.

Health Services Credential - School Nurse Program Coordinators, as documented in the institutional self-study, reported proposed curriculum revisions. Included in the revisions is NU241 Selective Clinical Practicum, (1u), a new practicum specifically designed for nursing in the educational setting. The practicum will provide 45 hours to attain the standards and professional competencies in Category V and to apply and practice those standards and competencies in a school setting. NU241 will be paired in Spring semester 2003 with NU227 Nursing in the Schools, the substantive theory and content course for school nurses. Didactic and clinical experiences are related and integrated to promote optimal learning.

Standard 20 Clinical and Theoretical Knowledge   **Minimally Met**
                                                             Qualitative Concerns

The institution meets the standard minimally as it offers one theory course, NU227, (three units) in the Health Services Credential-School Nurse Program curriculum focused solely on school nursing. The course includes theory and clinical knowledge as a basis for decision-making in nursing practice.

The other 28 units for the Program are housed within the Nurse Practitioner specialty tracks. NU227 is the only course Health Services Credential-School Nurse Program in which candidates cover the knowledge, skills and competencies required by the CTC guidelines. The NU227 is the course designed to progress logically from general nursing knowledge to the more specific content and learning experiences needed for advanced nursing practice in the school setting. The textbook of record is not specific for school nurses, has a publication date of 1996, and there exists many other appropriate publications to choose from. NU227 is offered every other spring semester. A part-time faculty member has taught the last two offerings. The faculty member reports no communication lines between individuals who teach the school health theory course and those preceptors who supervise the school health practicum.

In Spring 2002, the School of Nursing faculty approved a revised Health Services Credential- School Nurse Program curriculum plan. The plan includes credit allocation for NU227, Nursing in the Schools, to be increased from 3 to 4 units to provide for substantive content provision. Because there has been no specialist in school nursing among the full-time faculty, effective March 2002, a faculty person was appointed to a newly created position, Assistant Program Coordinator HSC-SN Program. In anticipation of teaching NU227 in Spring 2003, the new person has updated the course syllabus, selected a number of appropriate text and reference publications, and will assist and monitor school-based clinical placement sites for HSC:SN program students.

Included in the revisions is an added requirement for NU 244, Behavior and Development: Birth through Adolescence (2u), and NU 214, Behavior and Development Practicum (1u). This course and practicum will greatly strengthen both the theoretical and clinical preparation of the HSC: SN students.

As the Health Services Credential-School Nurse Program currently exists, there is a qualitative concern with this standard. With the anticipated changes, the institution will meet all the elements of the standard.

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

The BIR team members recommend that more of an effort be taken to provide alternative criteria and procedures to encourage recruitment and admission of candidates from underrepresented groups.

Specialist in Special Education
Based on feedback from current students, the team recommends that the Special Education faculty consider revising the EDSP 171/271--- "Management of Behavior & Instruction (2)" to expand the course unit allocation to ensure adequate practice of knowledge and skills related to applied behavioral analysis, functional assessment, and provision of positive behavioral support as mandated in PL 105-17 as well as state legislation..

Administrative Services Credential Programs

The team recommends that the full time faculty be somehow involved in oversight and review of course content delivered by district personnel. The document said that wherever district personnel were teaching there would be a full time faculty partner. The practices revealed by students and faculty members show this practice to be inconsistent among all sections of all courses.

In cohort programs where regular program courses are replaced by workshop sessions and special topic presentations, the content and design of such sessions should also receive faculty review prior to implementation.

The team recommends that administrative assistants and cohort coordinators for various district based clusters be thoroughly cross-trained on each one of the other clusters' models and patterns.

The institution is commended for already forming a cohort that will, in time, become its Tier Two beginning class and is already providing formal and supervised induction and support for them. The team recommends that the redesign of an overall integrated view of Tier One be included in considering the design of the Tier Two program so that there is a seamless transition for tier one students into professional level preparation without frustrating redundancies.

Health Services Credential – School Nurse Program

The faculty and administration of the Hahn School of Nursing and Health Sciences are to be commended for their dedication and commitment to academic development. The Health Services Credential – School Nurse Program model prepares confident and competent nurses for leadership roles in a variety of settings in the ever-changing and evolving health care system.

The increase of the core theory course, NU227, from 3 units to 4 units accurately reflects the value of the course for the School Nurse Program. It is recommended to offer the course in a module format over two semesters. The format would allow for breadth and depth of the content over the three to four semester program.

Because of the strong role played by the person in the position of Assistant Program Coordinator Health Services Credential-School Nurse Program, it is critical that the institution continue to make that position a priority for the nursing program.

The Credential Programs in the School of Education and the School of Nursing should continue collaboration for candidates in the Administrative Services, Pupil Personnel Services, Special Education and Health Services Programs as these professionals will be working collaboratively in school settings.